

dent Eisenhower for his staunch support of the United States and for his leadership in the hemispheric fight against communism is disregarded. The demand of the hour is to please Betancourt. And the price which Betancourt has demanded is the life of Perez Jimenez.

The long legal case for Perez Jimenez's extradition, which was initiated immediately after Betancourt came to power, is now entering its last lap. The former President's lawyers have filed papers with the U.S. Supreme Court, for the final legal recourse, an appeal to the Supreme Court. Within 30 days, the answer will come. If it is adverse, Perez Jimenez will be turned over to the State Department for deportation. Only President Kennedy's intervention can save him. And President Kennedy is the man who told Betancourt on February 19 that "You are the kind of President whom the United States wants to have in Latin America."

What is behind this case? Certainly there is more than meets the eye in this vengeful determination of those high in this administration to destroy Perez Jimenez. It has been brought out that Betancourt's lawyer in this country, who has been permitted to conduct the legal extradition proceedings against Perez Jimenez, is the firm of Covington and Burling of which Dean Acheson is the senior partner. But there are other influences.

First of all, let us be honest with ourselves. Perez Jimenez is not in danger of extradition because he has embezzled money, the technical charge. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Latin America knows that the corruption-in-office charge against his predecessor is routine procedure by every successful revolutionary newcomer to discredit his opponents. Perez Jimenez used this leverage against Betancourt himself, and with some justification, when he deposed him in the coup of 1948. We may disregard this charge as only a convenient pretext. If it had not been embezzlement, it would have been something else.

I have in my possession a copy of an affidavit by Miguel Silvio Sanz Anez, now a prisoner—if he is still alive—in the Venezuelan political prison, San Juan de los Morros. It was smuggled out of the prison and witnessed by his lawyer, Dr. Benjamin Nunez Escobar. It is dated February 8, 1963.

Mr. Sanz Anez was a section chief of the Ministry of Interior under Perez Jimenez. Imprisoned in 1958, he is still waiting for trial. In his affidavit he makes the following illuminating statement:

The same judge of arraignment who had issued the warrant of arrest to obtain my deliverance from the Embassy of Colombia, had me transferred at midnight one day to the Department of Indicted Military Personnel and told me that the Government had authorized him to make the following proposal: if I signed a statement accusing ex-President General Perez Jimenez of ordering the death of several political leaders of the opposition, I would be given a substantial sum of money and would be released and taken to the neighboring island of Curacao, Dutch territory, acquitted of all

accusations. Upon my negative answer, I was ordered to be secluded in a place of disciplinary punishment called the "tank."

Since Mr. Sanz Anez risked his life, and that of his lawyer, to make this statement, it is certainly reasonable to believe that he told the truth. The affidavit throws a flood of light upon the way in which the Betancourt government has whipped up its extradition case against Perez Jimenez. When it was unable to get a witness who would perjure himself by charging murder, the government settled for the milder charge of embezzlement. The important thing was to get Perez Jimenez back to Venezuela to one of the notorious Betancourt political prisons.

Of the possibility of a fair trial for Perez Jimenez, once the United States turns him over to Betancourt, Mr. Sanz Anez makes a significant comment. He is to be believed because he has spent 5 years in Betancourt's political prisons and knows the score.

If this is the treatment and nature of proceedings accorded me and those mentioned, what treatment would be accorded to Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez and what would be the nature of the proceedings against him should his extradition be granted and he be delivered to Venezuelan authorities? It is evident that there would be no guarantee for his defense, that the proceedings would be surrounded by all kinds of irregularities and violations of the law that would permit its delay and indefinite paralyzation, that there would not be an impartial and just trial and that his life would be in jeopardy and the danger of death would hover about his head. And if his murder is consummated, it will be disguised in such a form as to permit Venezuelan authorities to excuse themselves and show the U.S. Government that it was all an accident.

If this warning that Perez Jimenez would not receive a fair trial if returned to Venezuela seems unconvincing, the surmise has had grim confirmation in the last 2 months. To test the fairness of Betancourt's Venezuela courts, the lawyers for Perez Jimenez, on February 13, 1963, filed an action with the Supreme Court of Venezuela to annul the embezzlement charge on the ground that the proceedings had not conformed to Venezuelan law.

What was the answer?

Instead of handing down a ruling in the annulment plea which had been entered, the court declared that, inasmuch as Perez Jimenez had not been arrested in Venezuela, he had no right to file or participate in any legal proceedings in Venezuela.

This was a barefaced and naked violation of Venezuelan law.

It happens that in 1928 Venezuela was one of the nations which signed the "code of bustamento" on extradition at the Sixth Congress of American States at Havana. This code specifically states—article 369—that:

The person detained may also thereafter use the legal remedies which are considered proper in the state which requests the extradition against the qualifications and resolutions upon which the latter is founded.

In other words, the code which Venezuela has signed specifically covers the situation in which Perez Jimenez now

finds himself, and gives him the right to sue in the courts of Venezuela.

In refusing to accept the suit, Betancourt's supreme court plainly shows that it proposes to conduct the trial of Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, without regard to the law of Venezuela. If he goes back, he returns to be tried in a kangaroo court. His fate is certain.

Can the United States afford to be a party to any such proceedings? Have we sunk so low that we have accepted the role of hangman for Romulo Betancourt? I cannot believe that, upon sober second thought, President Kennedy wants to have such a blot upon his administration.

The United States has gone far in its abject pursuit of the good will of Betancourt's leftist government in Venezuela. Many Americans believe that we have made a major mistake in placing all our Latin American eggs in the Betancourt basket. Many informed people believe that Betancourt, with the help of such leftist and crypto-Communist allies as Haya de la Torre, Arevalo, Bosch, and Paz Estenssoro is erecting a third force of untrustworthy leftist nations in this hemisphere which will someday be even more dangerous to America's future than is Fidel Castro himself.

Let there be no illusions. Gen. Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, will have been liquidated because Betancourt regards him as the only Venezuelan of sufficient prestige to rally the conservatives of Venezuela into a dangerous opposition to his permanent rule in that unhappy nation.

His extradition case is a specious political plot. The United States must not play the jackal role for Betancourt in these proceedings.

CUBA AND THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the problems of Cuba and the Atlantic alliance, we must never let our attention drift too far from the brave peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. These gallant souls have been subjected to Communist domination without free elections, without any of the legal processes of a democratic system. Overwhelmingly anti-Communist, these nations deserve a chance to choose their own form of government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a concurrent resolution asking the President to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union to withdraw their troops and agents from the three nations, to return the Baltic exiles from Soviet exile and slave-labor camps. The United Nations should then conduct free elections in these three nations.

MINUTEMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. HALL) was given permission to extend

lan committee, which has a top-flight reputation for integrity.

The Nation has every confidence in Senator McClellan. He should probe this contract—perhaps others by the Pentagon—with exhaustive vigor. Complete scrutiny is impressively due.

Rumors, now open charges of political manipulation in defense contracts, have been rife for so long, only the naive in Washington think there is no truth in the reports.

Campaigning Kennedys, as well as other politicians of both parties, have implied or actually promised their election would reap more defense industry for particular areas. John F. Kennedy made precisely such pledges in stumpings West Virginia. After he became President, new contracts went to West Virginia.

When Gov. Pat Brown was beating the hustings in California against Richard M. Nixon he boldly asked, "How could the State expect a GOP Governor to get as many contracts and projects for California as a Democratic intimate of the Kennedy administration?"

Senator Case of New Jersey recently asked from the Senate floor, "Is national interest the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts?"

Washington rumor is that certain Congressmen are seeking to trade votes for major administration legislation—in return for defense or other jobs in their bailiwicks.

Secretary McNamara will testify before the Senate committee later. Perhaps he can justify the highly controversial TFX contract. He certainly will have full opportunity. His explanation should be bared to the Nation.

No one wants arbitrarily or in partisan spleen to sap "the integrity" of Mr. McNamara and discredit the administration. But it has become too pat a gambit of the New Frontier whenever criticism or policy dispute arises, to wrap itself in a mantle of righteousness and howl persecution.

The country has a perfect right to know whether the administration is playing political touch football with multi-billion-dollar defense funds.

WOOL IMPORT THREAT

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the entire New England delegation was saddened by an announcement that the Marland Plant of the J. P. Stevens Co. in Andover, Mass., was closing down operations. Over 453 persons will lose their jobs. The New England delegation to Congress has repeatedly asked President Kennedy to take action to help New England's wool business.

We have sent him telegrams.

We have written letters.

We have made telephone calls.

On February 20, I wrote President Kennedy asking him to take immediate action to save our wool business.

HE HAS DONE NOTHING

I urged him to immediately impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of woolen goods to the country. He has done nothing.

President Kennedy's replies have become increasingly vague. As things stand now, no one in Washington knows whether or not President Kennedy intends to help the wool business.

Here in Congress, we have been seized by Presidential message. The problems that have concerned the President have ranged from the purely local to State, national, international, and, indeed, outer space. What I want to know and what the Nation wants to know, is when the Presidential concern is going to evidence itself with some tangible and practical action.

COMMUNITIES ARE SUFFERING

People are losing their jobs and their livelihood. Whole communities are suffering. The Kennedy administration has repeatedly promised to help the wool manufacturing industry just as it did for cotton. Equal treatment, fairplay, and the keeping of promises is all the wool industry is asking. Is this too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to the reason for the closing of the Marland plant. Fabrics coming in from Japan, similar to those made at the Marland plant, are being offered for sale at 40 cents per yard under the Marland plant's actual cost.

Someone will probably suggest that the Marland plant has gone out of business because it is marginal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The J. P. Stevens Co. has spent \$1,550,000 to improve the Marland plant since the Korean crisis. By international standards, it is a modern plant.

During the Korean war, this plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces. Should we face another Korean-type war, we would have to look to foreign countries to provide the material formerly produced by the Marland plant.

Andover is losing a large payroll. This loss will affect other areas of our great country which supply consumer goods to Andover. When a plant in New England goes out of business, inevitably all sections of our country are affected. On March 27, 1963, Mr. John P. Baum, vice president of the J. P. Stevens Co., made the following statement about the closing of the Marland plant. It says:

TEXT OF MARCH 27, 1963, ANNOUNCEMENT BY COL. JOHN P. BAUM, OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC.

After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision, as it affects the current employment of 453 people.

This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.

The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment is thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of \$1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.

The closing of the Maryland plant with the

resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.

This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces.

It is hoped that responsible Federal Government officials will take the necessary corrective action to solve the woolen and worsted import problem before additional American mills are forced to close.

It is our intention to exert our maximum effort and to utilize our fullest resources to maintain full operations in all of our remaining plants.

The closing of the Marland plant is just the beginning. As sure as night follows day, we can expect other plant closings.

In 1960, Candidate Kennedy did a lot of talking about "getting this country moving again." The people of New England are getting fed up with President Kennedy's brand of "moving" that means closing plants and increased unemployment.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

(Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the United States has always had particular pride in its tradition of political asylum. Right now we are sheltering over 100,000 refugees from Castro's Communist rule, and rightly so. Even though the guests whom we have sheltered have not always been of our choice, we have consistently maintained this right of sanctuary. It has been an inviolable part of the American tradition.

In the whole history of the United States, there is no instance of a refugee President or ruler of a foreign country whom we have sent back to his political enemies to be butchered.

Unhappily there are indications that we are about to break this tradition.

Responding to some imperative of the New Frontier foreign policy, there are unmistakable signs that the administration in contemplating the turning over of former President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela to vengeance and probable death at the hands of Romulo Betancourt. The fact that Betancourt and Perez Jimenez are bitter political enemies and that it was Perez Jimenez who upset Betancourt's leftist timetable by 10 years, by turning him out of the Venezuelan Government in 1948, does not give pause to those in high places who are clamoring for the former President's deportation. The fact that Perez Jimenez, while President, was decorated by Presi-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5229

his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud of the part it played in the struggle of our Nation for independence. Many of the communities that are a part of what is now the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, witnessed the first Revolutionary battles.

In order that the battle sites might be preserved, the Minuteman National Historical Park has been established in Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, Mass.

The National Park Service has recommended an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for land acquisition within the park and I am pleased to note that my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee recognize the historical significance of the area and have approved the appropriation request for the bill which is before us today.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support this program. Approval of the appropriation request will allow the Service to preserve the proper facilities for the visiting public in accord with Mission 66 launched in 1956. As you know, this is the Service's long-range comprehensive national park protection and use program scheduled for completion in 1966, the golden anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service.

The Service, with the help of Congress, will be allowed to continue to make headway in preserving our Nation's great past.

(Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. SHORT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SHELLEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

COIN CLUB REQUESTS RECOINAGE OF SILVER DOLLAR

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of

my home town of Butte, Mont., is the first, I believe, organized coin club in the United States to request recoinage of our de facto domestic unit of value, the standard silver dollar. Following is a resolution submitted by the above mentioned club:

Whereas we are U.S. citizens and members in good standing of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of Butte, Mont., and are students of coins and currencies of other nations as well as our own and standard silver dollars are a prerequisite as media of exchange in our daily trade; and

Whereas the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains, 900 fine or 371¼ grains of pure silver, has not been struck since October 1935 nor has a new design been issued since the December 1921 Peace Dollar and average of major periods for not coining the silver dollar since 1794 has been 26 years and average between new designs has been 42 years; and

Whereas over 60 million standard silver dollars have been withdrawn as uncirculated during last 20 years for an 11 percent reduction of total stock without replacement, nor has there been any allowance made for a 50 percent population increase during last three decades even though standard silver dollars in circulation have risen 1,275 percent to an alltime high; and

Whereas end of December 1962 there were over \$2 billion in bullion on deposit with our custodian in the Treasury of the United States which are now securing working representative certificates, redeemable on demand, with only 76.3 million silver dollars acting as certificate security for one of the smallest coverages of representative paper since 1883, and over 38.5 million silver dollars were reclaimed during year for the largest total redemption in the history of that coin; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized by the Congress under section 5 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 to coin the standard silver dollar and no further authority is required for recoinage nor for a new design as 25 year waiting period between new designs has elapsed; and

Whereas section 4(b) of the act of July 6, 1939 makes standard silver dollar coinage mandatory on all newly acquired domestic silver under that act, excepting seigniorage bullion, and there are over \$80.6 million in representative silver purchase certificates secured by unstruck bullion, so acquired, and delivery of standard silver dollars in that amount is mandatory to owners, who are certificate holders: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club in our regular monthly meeting assembled, do hereby respectfully and unanimously request the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America to resume immediate coinage of our legal standard silver dollar from bullion now on hand using the Peace Dollar design to be followed as soon as practical by a new design reflecting the period and times we are living in such as the space age.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT ITS POLICY IN RESTRICTING EXILES WHO PARTICIPATE IN RAIDS ON COMMUNIST CUBA IS NO GUARANTEE OF PROTECTION FOR CASTRO

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States should not interfere with foreign based operations against Com-

munist Cuba. While enforcing our neutrality laws we should not deny Cubans the right to leave the United States for any other country of their choice. The United States should support the desire of Cubans to restore Cuba to a democratic society by recognizing a provisional government of free Cuba.

ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my able and hardworking colleague from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] concerning a report from the General Accounting Office "on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center." I believe that steps should be taken to correct the conditions described in the GAO report and pledge my support to the gentleman from Delaware in an effort to do so.

The GAO report indicates that ineffective repair parts support results from the failure of the Army Tank-Automotive Center to follow certain parts procurement and reordering procedures which GAO believes would be more conducive to efficient operations.

The Army Tank-Automotive Center is located in Metropolitan Detroit. It is a successor to the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which was likewise based at Detroit. This Army Ordnance unit has been located in the Detroit area for many years. To the best of my knowledge it was never located in any other place.

During 1961 the Army undertook to dispose of underutilized Government-owned production facilities. As part of that program the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., was closed and declared surplus to Army needs. The production that had been performed at Lenape Ordnance Modification Center which had been under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was transferred to other points but was still under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. There is no indication in the report of the General Accounting Office or elsewhere, that the closing of the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center or production of the M-60 tank at the Detroit tank plant had anything to do with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of ATAC's repair parts support function.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

5230

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN to revise and extend remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous matter, following remarks of Mr. GROSS on his amendment at page 24 of H.R. 5279.

Mr. CANNON and to include an address by the president of the Independent Bankers' Association of America.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOELSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER immediately following the President's foreign aid message.

Mr. WYMAN immediately following the remarks of Mr. ALGER.

Mr. MORSE during debate on H.R. 5279.

Mr. SNYDER during debate on H.R. 5279.

Mr. ALGER during debate on H.R. 5279.

Mr. MOORE during debate on H.R. 5279.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BELL in five instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. WYDLER in five instances.

Mr. HORTON in five instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. LIPSCOMB in two instances.

Mr. ALGER in five instances.

Mr. WESTLAND in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.

Mr. MORSE in three instances.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR in three instances.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. GAVIN in four instances.

Mr. NORBLAD in four instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT in 10 instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. CAREY in two instances.
Mr. MULTER in three instances.
Mr. MINISH.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. WILLIS in two instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. WAGGONNER.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. BOGGS in three instances.

Mr. SHELLEY in three instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. RYAN of New York in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in six instances.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mrs. HANSEN to revise and extend her remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 1, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

829. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that two appropriations to the executive branch agencies for the fiscal year 1963 have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

830. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting the 15th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

831. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil

Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize certain amounts received by way of reimbursement for medical supplies and equipment to be used to purchase other medical supplies and equipment"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

832. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

833. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of target seeking systems under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-38098 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the production of Bomarc missiles and related spare parts and support equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

834. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to submitting a draft of a contract relating to proposed drainage work exceeding a total cost of \$200,000 on the Crooked River project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

835. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

836. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the first annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

838. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

839. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; with amendments (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

5154

000 value are growing larger and are largely mechanized.

The full text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, resulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land and the effects of such changes on the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning for such changes in land use and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

Sec. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, regional, State and local planning boards and commissions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other public agency, to—

(1) make investigations and surveys in connection with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;

(2) make studies necessary for the interpretation of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance in connection with such planning; and

(4) obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

COLLEGE EXPENSES SHOULD BE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a tax deduction for the expenses of higher education incurred by either full- or part-time students or their parents.

The rising costs of higher education prevent many capable students from continuing their studies. During the past decade, tuition fees have risen some 86 percent, putting such opportunities far beyond the reach of many unable to meet these expenses. The legislation which I have introduced would include deductions for the costs of ordinary living expenses as well as the cost of books and tuition.

College and university enrollment is expected to increase some 30 percent by 1965, and 66 percent by 1970. The im-

pact of these figures can be readily seen in Florida, where we are building new facilities and enlarging present ones to keep pace with our expanding industrial and social needs.

However, as a nation, we should not concentrate solely on technical education, but should strive to provide the facilities necessary to produce well-rounded citizens. Our national survival may well depend on this Nation's ability to train its most precious resource—brainpower.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that this legislation to provide tax deductions for education expenses would accomplish the desired results through rewarding individual initiative rather than relying on comprehensive Federal assistance. This principle seems more in keeping with our national goals, and by the adoption of this legislation I have introduced today we will achieve these goals efficiently instead of adding to our already overburdening programs of Federal spending.

CUBAN COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which the Cuban Communist government poses to the Western Hemisphere is one of the most serious this Nation has had to face. But face it we must.

Those of us from the great State of Florida are keenly aware of this cancerous sore which festers only 90 miles off our State's shore. We have absorbed thousands of Cuban refugees fleeing from Communist tyranny, and particularly do the people of the Miami area see firsthand the misery and despair, the anguish and the heartbreak, of the people of this once proud and free land.

For these remarks I do not wish to dwell upon the tyranny of the Batista regime, only to say that what the Cuban people now suffer is far worse than anything seen under that dictatorship. And neither can be condoned. What we must deal with now is the present crisis, the existence of a Cuban Government under the domination of communism, an international godless plague.

I have said on many occasions that I fear far more the subversion which is promulgated by the Cuban Communist dictatorship than I do the remaining Soviet troops on that island.

For international communism has gained a foothold, and unless rooted out, will infest another Latin American nation, and then possibly another. This is the threat we face, and one which we must meet.

I was proud of our President when he pledged to the Cuban freedom fighters in Miami recently that their battle flag would be returned to them in a free Havana. This should be the pledge of all Americans.

Recent events have again brought into sharp focus the dangers of the subversive activities of Cuban communism in

the Western Hemisphere. These dangers challenge not only the United States, in its quest for peace and security, but every one of our Central and South American neighbors, and the entire free world.

For our Latin American neighbors are more vulnerable than we to these activities, which have as their objective the overthrow of governments and the installation of Soviet-dominated puppet regimes similar to that of Fidel Castro.

We in the Congress, and the American people, concerned as we are with the security of our great Nation, must maintain an awareness of the nature and scope of these activities. Toward this end, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on "Castro-Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere." I recommend highly to all Members that they study the report of these hearings.

For my part, I would like to point out some of the things I have learned recently about this threat, in the hope that such information might in some way contribute to the full realization of this threat.

First, I would like to remind my colleagues of some of the techniques of subversion which are being employed throughout the hemisphere by the Cuban-based Sino-Soviet Communist movement. Recruitment and training of new adherents to the revolutionary line are prime activities of Communist agents in every country in the Western Hemisphere, including probably the United States. Recruits are normally sent to primary training schools first, and then on a basis of performance and reliability, may be sent to further centers for training activities of all kinds: Leaders, orators and propagandists; experts in sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in all its forms; specialists in the handling of arms and radio equipment, in guerrilla warfare, and so forth. Recruitment is carried on preferably among students, teachers, workers, artists, and writers. Some selected few students of subversion are sent on to advanced schools, where courses may last a maximum of 3 years. These schools refine the skills and techniques learned earlier, and train the man or woman as a party functionary. On an even higher level, there are schools in Russia and other bloc countries where personnel are trained to occupy key posts in the party or other allied agencies.

The next Communist technique employed in Latin America is infiltration into previously selected organizations and institutes in order, progressively and methodically, to gain absolute direction and control of them. Infiltration is undertaken in any social class, in government agencies, social and cultural centers, student groups, labor unions, and even in armed forces. The priority and magnitude of that infiltration will depend on the facilities found, the environment in which action is taken, and the aim being sought.

Another Communist technique being used in Latin America as elsewhere is called psychological penetration. An

changing. These officials must make important decisions on how much good farmland can be retained for agriculture, how to utilize wetlands and woodlands as open green areas with water developments for recreation and wildlife.

Recognition of these special problems has brought about a new development in my State with the establishment of conservation commissions by many communities. Nearly 30 have already been established in my district alone and it is expected the total number in the State will soon reach 200.

These conservation commissions are working intensively on inventories of their towns' natural resources and are helping to develop plans for greenbelts and wildlife preservation. In increasing numbers, the commissions are turning to the Soil Conservation Districts for help on the technical features of their soil and water management problems. Increasing requests for Federal assistance are reaching me in recent months and I am cooperating fully with many town officials in seeking for their communities Soil Conservation Service help on a large number of drainage and water problems.

I have previously addressed the House on the value and importance of the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service. This program has been of great assistance to many Massachusetts communities which suffered losses in the 1955 floods.

There have been two watershed work plans developed in my district under the Small Watersheds Act with the State and the towns in each watershed contributing toward the total costs. The first is the Suasco project, named after the Sudbury, Assabet and Concord Rivers in the watershed, which is being developed at an estimated cost of \$1,660,000 of which \$650,000 will be paid by the State, the towns benefitting and the local landowners.

The second is the upper Quaboag project with a total estimated cost of \$2,750,000, of which about \$1 million will be borne by the State, local towns and landowners. The watershed plan for this project was completed in the summer of 1961. After careful review by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, upper Quaboag was authorized for construction last September.

The upper Quaboag project consists of a dike, some channel enlargement and eight reservoirs, three of which are multiple purpose. The work will also provide fish and wildlife habitat improvement, recreation and flood prevention. The State plans to add recreation benefits to one reservoir, while the town of Leicester plans to add municipal water supply to another reservoir in the group.

There are three great ponds in the watershed that will be greatly improved because the water level will not be raised to a great extent in time of flooding.

The upper Quaboag watershed project is located in the western end of my district with work earmarked for Shaw Brook in Spencer and Leicester, Turkey

Hill Brook in Spencer, Meadow Brook in New Braintree, and Kittredge Brook in Spencer. The balance of the work will be done in towns lost to the Third District as a result of the congressional redistricting last year: Meadow Brook in North Brookfield, Sucker Brook in West Brookfield, Lamberton Brook in Warren, Horsepond Brook in Brookfield, and Rice Reservoir in Brookfield.

The project also calls for a concrete dike along the East Brookfield River in East Brookfield to protect industrial plants and stream channel improvements along the Quaboag, beginning in Warren and extending into West Brookfield to provide flood protection to industrial and residential areas at the Quaboag marshes and Quaboag and Quacumquasit Ponds.

The Suasco project with 7 dams and reservoirs when completed will provide flood protection and other benefits to a 31-town area extending from Shrewsbury to Lowell. As planned, Suasco calls for seven dams—one each in Shrewsbury and Westboro, two in Berlin, and three in Northboro.

The Suasco work is being carried out by the Middlesex and Northern Worcester County Soil Conservation Districts, the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The Suasco watershed project is among the first to be approved for Massachusetts under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When completed, the project will help reduce and control floodwaters at key points on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers and their tributaries. The project starts at the Assabet River in Northboro and extends to the junctions of the Sudbury and Concord Rivers in Concord, then to the Merrimack River in Lowell. In all some 377 square miles of watershed are involved with the flood prevention work designed to help these Third District communities, some of which were added to my district as a result of the redistricting last year: Maynard, Upton, Marlboro, Boxboro, Sherborn, Berlin, Littleton, Westford, Harvard, Clinton, Acton, Bolton, Holliston, Stow, Natick, and Hudson.

Other towns included in the Suasco watershed are: Carlisle, Lincoln, Framingham, Shrewsbury, Chelmsford, Sudbury, Grafton, Tewksbury, Weston, Ashland, Westboro, Billerica, Wayland, Southboro, Boylston, Bedford, Concord, Hopkinton and Northboro.

The watershed program is one of several important Federal programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service. Another is the National Cooperative Soil Survey, which is helping to provide basic soils information to many of our towns on a cost-sharing basis.

Four towns in my district have initiated action to share costs with the Soil Conservation Service for the basic soil interpretations they need—Sterling, Millis, Littleton and Acton. Of the 351 towns in Massachusetts, it is estimated at least half have urgent need for soils information.

This is a worthwhile program which deserves the support of the Congress, Mr. Speaker. My bill would help to improve and strengthen this national program.

For instance, my district has about 790,000 acres and only 132,000 acres have been soil surveyed. Completed soil survey maps are needed right now in Massachusetts, but the mapping job for my State is currently projected for completion by 1985, based upon current appropriations.

A large number of land use and water problems are being solved by many communities in my State in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts. It has been demonstrated that the skills developed in handling soil, land use and water problems on farms can be applied directly in many cases to similar problems on nonfarmland. My bill would provide greater authority to the soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service in making available their skills to the many communities in my State and in the Nation which could benefit considerably from these needed services.

As an illustration, I cite the town of Spencer in my district, which recently suffered the loss of its main industry through the relocation of a shoe factory to the nearby town of North Brookfield. Town officials have requested the Soil Conservation Service to provide water and flooding facts on a commercial development on great meadows adjacent to the Seven Mile River and Hare Brook near Route 9.

The town has a sewage plant in the area, which needs to be enlarged. The town has asked for information on the extent of flooding to be expected in the area after the upper Quaboag watershed project is installed. This information is needed to help control building in the area.

I have been assured that the Soil Conservation Service will make the necessary studies for Spencer as soon as personnel can be detailed to this work from other activities.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts would be able to cope more efficiently and rapidly with the many demands for technical assistance in land and water use problems reaching them from many communities.

The Soil Conservation Service is very active in Worcester County and agricultural conservation program work in this county represents the largest share of Federal aid to farmers in Massachusetts. In all, there about 258,000 acres of farmland in the county. Farmers employ some 16,000 workers and do about a \$27 million annual business. Farming is a most important part of the Worcester County economic picture.

However, as in other urban areas, Worcester County farms are changing year by year. Recent farm censuses show that farm land has decreased about 100,000 acres in a 5-year period. Individual farms with an average \$27,-

effort is made to attract and convert indifferent people by exploiting the contradictions present in every organized society and the justified longings to resolve them. Attractive material easily accessible to the masses is prepared, and the penetration is carried out through the constant utterance and repetition of slogans adapted to the situation, as well as the affirmation of carefully chosen topics.

Next, dislocation, or weakening of the social structure, is pursued by the Communists. Freedom to congregate, the right to strike, and other liberties granted by democracy are abused; laws are labeled as antidemocratic or dictatorial, and the authorities are criticized and attacked as being solely responsible for the situation. All kinds of arms are employed and offenses are perpetrated against individuals and public and private property, thereby inciting violent action on the part of the police or the Army, which serves the Communists' ultimate ends of portraying the regime as oppressive.

Finally, through a process of proper organization, a military apparatus of growing complexity is created. Action, or shock teams, are first created which engage in hand fighting, sabotage, or acts of terror. We have seen Communist efforts in Venezuela to pass from this stage to the next, that of organized guerrilla warfare, culminating in the takeover of strategic areas, and finally, the overthrow of the local government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of these are the techniques of Communist subversion, and Cuba is the Western Hemisphere headquarters for training in these techniques. A series of schools and training centers have been set up there in which instruction is given not only to Cubans but to nationals from many other Latin American countries. There are perhaps a dozen of these schools in Cuba, some of them under Russian instructors. At least a thousand persons came to Cuba from Latin America during 1962 for training of this type. And as Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the CIA stated to the subcommittee:

In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage, and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland.

"Once you are there, we will keep in touch with you, give you propaganda support, send you propaganda materials for your movement, training aids to expand your guerrilla forces, secret communication methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

There have been organized, in addition to all this, groups whose purpose it is to facilitate the carrying of subversion to Latin America. Such groups as the Board of Liberation for Central America and the Caribbean, the Latin American Youth Organization, the Free Latin American Association, and others perform this function of spreading the Castro doctrine. A series of meetings, conferences, and congresses has been held in Cuba to give Communists and their

sympathizers from other Latin American countries a good excuse to go to Cuba for training or for strategy discussions and integration.

This is a grave problem, perhaps the most serious threat to the United States and the Western Hemisphere we have ever witnessed. It cannot be minimized, it cannot be swept under a rug. We must marshal the full resources of this Nation, and that of all Latin America, to meet this threat. So long as this threat of Cuban Communist subversion remains, this hemisphere is in grave danger. We must meet this threat with bold and vigorous action, for in my opinion, the free and abundant life which we seek for all men can never be achieved in this hemisphere so long as this threat remains.

ROGUE BASIN PROJECT FREIGHT RATE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN MEAT AND LIVESTOCK

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the RECORD a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7 pertaining to the Rogue Basin project and House Joint Memorial 13 pertaining to the historic freight rate differential between meat and livestock. These memorials were enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

Both these matters are of crucial importance to the State of Oregon. The Members of the Oregon congressional delegation are pleased to bring the memorials to the attention of this House.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of \$50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of \$365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

Introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Filcraft, Hansell and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of one to one, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic

5156

freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest in recent weeks several theories that have been advanced on the manner in which the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery should be organized and operated. A matter of growing concern is the fate of the seven Veterans' Administration area medical offices, each presently responsible for the supervision of a group of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics located in several States. Just recently, the Director of each of these area medical offices was transferred with a small staff to the Veterans' Administration central office in Washington. Meanwhile, the staff of specialists and technicians making up the area medical office continues to function in its field location. How the Area Medical Director can supervise his staff of specialists from Washington more efficiently than was previously possible from an adjoining office is a mystery to me. I sincerely hope that this move does not represent the first step in the complete elimination of area medical offices.

I have been privileged to receive a communication from Adm. Joel T. Boone, former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, expressing his views on this subject and the high quality of Veterans' Administration medicine in general. Admiral Boone is eminently qualified to speak on all matters affecting Veterans' Administration medicine. His background is rich with experience in the practice of medicine both on the field of combat under enemy fire and in peacetime in some of the finest naval hospitals in the Nation. Not only is he eminently qualified in the practice of medicine but he has proved to be an extremely capable administrator in his many assignments of increasing administrative responsibility in the U.S. Naval Hospital System culminated by 4 years as the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration.

Admiral Boone is a native of St. Clair, Pa. He was educated at Mercersburg

Academy and the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia. He began a distinguished naval career in 1914, served in combat with the Marines in Haiti in 1915, and in France during World War II. For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity while serving with the U.S. Marines in actual conflict with the enemy in France in July of 1918, he was awarded the highest honor this Nation can bestow upon a serviceman, the Congressional Medal of Honor. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with five Oak Leaf Clusters and the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters for wounds received in action. As medical officer of the presidential yacht for several years he treated Presidents Harding and Coolidge. As White House physician, he attended President Hoover, and for a brief period, President Roosevelt. He has held posts as chief medical officer of a single ship as well as an entire fleet. He has directed the operations of a single hospital as well as all hospitals in a naval district. He has served as General Medical Inspector for all hospitals in the entire naval system. In 1947, Admiral Boone directed a medical survey of the coal industry.

This survey devoted to medical problems encountered by coal miners and conditions affecting health in coal mines has been responsible for improving conditions for workers not only in the coal industry but in many other industries as well.

Shortly after his retirement from naval service in December of 1950 Admiral Boone assumed the responsibility of directing the nationwide network of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities. During the next 4 years he devoted all of his many talents and boundless energy to making the Veterans' Administration hospital program the greatest system of high quality medical care this country has ever known.

Admiral Boone, in his letter, shares my concern lest the Veterans' Administration medical program which has been labeled "second to none" and which he played a prominent role in establishing, deteriorate in any manner.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 21, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In compliance with your request, I submit a statement herewith, dealing with the area medical directors and area medical offices of the Veterans' Administration.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, of March 4, 1963, pages 3325-3328, published a speech by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, titled "Maintenance of Highest Medical Standards in Veterans' Administration," in which he, with obvious concern and at length, expressed an obvious deep concern as to an action taken by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in establishing offices in the central office of the Veterans' Administration here in Washington for the seven area medical directors. Then on March 11, 1963, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the

Appropriations Committee, made a speech in the House of Representatives in which he made special references to the area medical offices and the methods of function of the area medical directors and their respective staffs. The final paragraph of Congressman THOMAS' speech states: "The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals, so they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move."

It would seem from the above statement that Congressman THOMAS is unaware that some members of area medical staffs are non-medical personnel and hence are not qualified as practitioners of medicine.

To one who knows, from long association with and experience in dealing with the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program directly and indirectly, Congressman THOMAS' statement is shocking to me. Predicated on my knowledge and experience which has included day-to-day supervision and operation of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program for a statutory 4-year term of office, I can readily foresee that, if such a proposal were enacted, it would: first, seriously cause deterioration of the program and; then, destruction of it as a medical and hospital program, which is not excelled by any other medical and hospital program in the United States and, as far as is known, throughout the world.

My relationship with the Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Administration covers a span of 43 years. As far back as early 1920, when I was an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Navy following my duty with combat forces in France in World War I, one of my duties was a liaison officer with the then Veterans' Bureau. A request was made to the Surgeon General of the Navy by the then Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Bureau to release me from my duty with the Surgeon General for reassignment to duty with the Veterans' Bureau as the Deputy Chief Medical Officer. I declined this proffer of an administrative position outside of the Navy, but continued for the next 2 years in a liaison capacity with the Veterans' Bureau.

Over the years from time to time I had various and sundry relationships with the Veterans' Bureau and subsequently, when established, with the Veterans' Administration. It was on March 1, 1951, that I was sworn in as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. I had accepted a proffer of appointment very reluctantly, having been urged to do so from the highest authority in Government, against my wishes and desires, but I would add parenthetically that I am indeed immeasurably gratified that I accepted the position, for it gave me an opportunity to supervise the reputedly largest medical and hospital program in the world and required of me a most challenging and vital opportunity to serve again my country and the veterans of it, with many of whom I had served when they were in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

As the Veterans' Administration at the time of my appointment was under a senatorial investigation, to which Senator HUMPHREY made extensive reference in the Senate on March 4, 1963, he being the chairman of a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, I entered upon my duties as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration when the place was "on fire," "exploding," and "under attack." I could not have assumed these new duties at a more difficult and harassing period. It is not regarded as immodest to refer in passing to the adjust-

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

CUBAN ANTI-CASTRO GROUPS

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Colossians 3: 14: Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness.

Almighty God, our Father, who art the same, yesterday, today, and forever, amid all the miseries and mutations of time, grant that our hearts may be the sanctuaries of Thy love.

May we feel the wealth and warmth of Thy love and seek to make it the commanding and controlling factor and force in our daily life.

Inspire us to discover in these critical and confused days that love is the one cardinal virtue that will cast out fear and constrain us to rise above all cold and rebellious tempers of spirit.

Hear us for the sake of our Lord who walked the road of the loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1035. An act to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-9.

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy to discourage Cuban exile raids on Castro's seacoast is a complete contradiction of our national goals.

It is true that the Government must uphold U.S. neutrality laws. However, this Nation has no right to interfere with the operations of foreign-based anti-Castro Cubans. Furthermore, the United States is not responsible for foreign-based raids against Communist Cuba.

It is argued that these hit-and-run raids have little significance. This argument is false. Hit-and-run tactics signaled the beginning of Castro's rise to power. The Communists are using these same tactics even now to subvert Latin America.

The Cuban Communists do not want war in the Caribbean, and they have backed down with an apology for firing on a U.S. boat last Saturday. Freeing Cuba is a job for Cubans, and I certainly hope the United States will encourage them to do it.

BLOCKADE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record at this point.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, at last the United States and Great Britain have established a blockade of Cuba, but, unfortunately, the United States seems to have lost sight of its values and traditions, for through this blockade our country is protecting Castro from those Cuban exiles who yearn to return freedom to their homeland. I find it extremely hard to understand why we are actually protecting a Communist government and suppressing the activities of people who are fighting to rid Cuba of the Communist menace. This is a complete reversal from our policy of aiding the anti-Castro invasion just 2 years ago. How foolish it is to take steps which permit communism to survive in Cuba when we all realize that Cuba is the chief steppingstone to the establishment of communism throughout Central and South America. Our excuse for protecting Castro seems weak, indeed, when we glance back at our own history of fighting for freedom and human rights. It seems to me that the attacks launched against the Communist Cuba would have a terrific morale-boosting effect on those patriots still in Cuba, who with sufficient evidence of support could rid their country of communism.

How can any of our South American allies gain confidence in the policies of the United States when with one hand we tell the anti-Castro forces that we want them to free their homeland while with the other hand we take steps to insure that they will not? To make matters worse, we are now playing the role of informant against the Cuban patriots as well as protector for Castro.

In my opinion, the administration has failed to understand our demands for a blockade of Cuba, for what we are demanding was a blockade of Communist Cuba, not a blockade of freedom.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," wrote Milton. And no peacetime victory in history has been as far reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well, as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs. These victories have been, in the main, quiet instead of dramatic. Their aim has been, not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United Nations, but to preserve freedom and hope, and to prevent tyranny and subversion, in dozens of key nations all over the world.

The United States today is spending over 10 percent of its gross national product on programs primarily aimed at improving our national security. Somewhat less than one-twelfth of this amount, and less than 0.7 percent of our GNP, goes into the mutual assistance program: roughly half for economic development, and half for military and other short-term assistance. The contribution of this program to our national

interest clearly outweighs its cost. The richest nation in the world would surely be justified in spending less than 1 percent of its national income on assistance to its less fortunate sister nations solely as a matter of international responsibility; but inasmuch as these programs are not merely the right thing to do, but clearly in our national self-interest, all criticisms should be placed in that perspective. That our aid programs can be improved is not a matter of debate. But that our aid programs serve both our national traditions and our national interest is beyond all reasonable doubt.

History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavyhanded Soviet pressures, Greece to put down Communist aggression and both to recreate stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

History records that the Marshall plan made it possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia, and to embark on an economic renaissance which has made Western Europe the second greatest and richest industrial complex in the world today—a vital center of free world strength, itself now contributing to the growth and strength of less developed countries.

History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the Communist world—such as Iran, Pakistan, India, Vietnam, and free China—has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent, when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive Communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty, and despair.

History records that our contributions to international aid have been the critical factor in the growth of a whole family of international financial institutions and agencies, playing an ever more important role in the ceaseless war against want and the struggle for growth and freedom.

And, finally, history will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children.

Despite noisy opposition from the very first days—despite dire predictions that foreign aid would bankrupt the Republic—despite warnings that the Marshall plan and successor programs were “throwing our money down a rathole”—despite great practical difficulties and some mistakes and disappointments—

the fact is that our aid programs generally and consistently have done what they were expected to do.

Freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world—not in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America—as it might well have been without U.S. aid. And we now know that freedom—all freedom, including our own—is diminished when other countries fall under Communist domination, as in China in 1949, North Vietnam and the northern provinces of Laos in 1954, and Cuba in 1959. Freedom, all freedom, is threatened by the subtle, varied and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better life based on economic progress, education, social justice and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing, they serve our deepest national interest.

This view has been held by three successive Presidents—Democratic and Republican alike.

It has been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of nine successive Congresses.

It has been supported for 17 years by a bipartisan majority of the American people.

And it has only recently been reaffirmed by a distinguished committee of private citizens, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay and including Messrs. Robert Anderson, Eugene Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert Lovett, Edward Mason, L. F. McCollum, George Meany, Herman Phleger, and Howard Rusk. Their report stated:

We believe these programs, properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our Nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities.

There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of U.S. assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt.

II. PRESENT NEEDS

The question now is: What about the future? In the perspective of these past gains, what is the dimension of present needs, what are our opportunities, and what changes do we face at this juncture in world history?

I believe it is a crucial juncture. Our world is near the climax of a historic convulsion. A tidal wave of national independence has nearly finished its sweep through lands which contain one out of every three people in the world. The industrial and scientific revolution is spreading to the far corners of the earth. And two irreconcilable views of the value, the rights, and the role of the individual human being confront the peoples of the world.

In some 80 developing nations, countless large and small decisions will be made in the days and months and years ahead—decisions which, taken together, will establish the economic and social

system, determine the political leadership, shape the political practices, and mold the structure of the institutions which will promote either consent or coercion for one-third of humanity. And these decisions will drastically affect the shape of the world in which our children grow to maturity.

Africa is stirring restlessly to consolidate its independence and to make that independence meaningful for its people through economic and social development. The people of America have affirmed and reaffirmed their sympathy with these objectives.

Free Asia is responding resolutely to the political, economic, and military challenge of Communist China's relentless efforts to dominate the continent.

Latin America is striving to take decisive steps toward effective democracy—amid the turbulence of rapid social change and the menace of Communist subversion.

The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision than we can withdraw from the community of free nations. Our effort is not merely symbolic. It is addressed to our vital security interests.

It is in this context that I hope the American people through their representatives in Congress will consider our request this year for foreign aid funds designed carefully and explicitly to meet these specific challenges. This is not a wearisome burden. It is a new chapter in our involvement in a continuously vital struggle—the most challenging and constructive effort ever undertaken by man on behalf of freedom and his fellow man.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT

In a changing world, our programs of mutual defense and assistance must be kept under constant review. My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay Committee, the scrutiny undertaken by the new Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the experience gained in our first full year of administering the new and improved program enacted by the Congress in 1961. There is fundamental agreement throughout these reviews that these assistance programs are of great value to our deepest national interest—that their basic concepts and organization, as embodied in the existing legislation, are properly conceived—that progress has been made and is being made in translating these concepts into action—but that much still remains to be done to improve our performance and make the best possible use of these programs.

In addition, there is fundamental agreement in all these reviews regarding six key recommendations for the future.

Objective No. 1: To apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries. This objective was given special attention by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World (the Clay report), which estimated that the application of such criteria could result in substantial

has been made to prevent these people from applying for registration. In fact, they have come forward by the hundreds to do so. They have been there at the instance of outside agitators who say, "You cannot get relief, you cannot get social security, you cannot get commodities unless you follow us, and follow us down the main street, against red lights, and deprive the citizens of the city of the right to govern their own affairs."

The suit which the Department of Justice has filed is not a voting rights suit. The question is, Can the people maintain order on the streets of their own city?

Mr. STENNIS. Through their own officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course; through their own officials. That is the test. Judge Clayton was eminently correct in his decision.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank my colleague. This situation can come close to home in the case of each of us in Washington in our official offices. It can come much closer home than anyone might think. Only last week some of this same group that is in Greenwood, Miss.—perhaps not the same individuals, but individuals with the same connections—showed up in our offices in the Senate Office Building, to parade and picket and make a show. The way we learned about the probable presence of these people in our offices was through the members of the Senate Press Gallery, who called and said, "Have they gotten there?"

The response was, "Whom are you talking about?"

We were told, "We have been called by this group and they said they were going to picket your offices."

The purpose is to make a show of publicity, to create a disturbance, and to create a false issue, merely to carry a point or to create a disturbance and mislead the American people.

It is pitiful to me—and I say this with the greatest respect to our news media—that items like this can be instantly picked up and publicized in every living room or drawing room, and on every newsstand all over the Nation, causing the public to fall victims to such misleading tactics and to planning of this kind.

It is a severe strain upon free government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I live close to the city of Greenwood. I was in Greenwood several days last week. I speak with firsthand knowledge. This demonstration had not caught on. There is not the tension in Greenwood that has been pictured in the eastern press. The movement is not supported by a majority of the Negro race or by a majority of the white race; in fact, it is condemned by a majority of the Negro race. The Justice Department action was merely an attempt to rescue a drowning baby. It is not possible to get citizens of the Negro race from the city of Greenwood to participate. So the instigators have gone into the rural areas and have contacted Negroes who want commodities and have said, "Join with us, and we will lead you

to the promised land, provided you march down the street, obstruct traffic, walk a red light, and go to the court house."

Those acts of walking down the street and obstructing traffic are the heart of the suit that has been filed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The officers, the board of aldermen, the mayor, the police, the city attorney, and others, are due the commendations and the appreciation of the whole body of people of the Nation, especially those who appreciate the difficulty that is always present when any kind of agitation starts which would try to pit the races one against the other.

I feel certain that every Senator, if he understood the situation, would join with me in heartily commending the action taken by those officials. I hope they will continue their pattern of conduct; I believe they will.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the understanding. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Alaska, with the understanding that I will not lose my place on the floor.

WHY STAND IN THE WAY OF CUBA'S FREEDOM FIGHTERS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday, while the able senior Senator

from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was criticizing the Cuban refugees for their raids on Castro's Cuba, I engaged in a colloquy with him in which I expressed my sympathy for, and understanding of, these courageous freedom fighters who feel impelled at the risk of their lives to strike whatever blows they can at Castro's totalitarian tyranny and its ruthless and bloody suppression of the liberties of the Cuban people.

While I did not engage in a lengthy discussion with the Senator, who was making his customarily effective presentation of the legal and other aspects of these raids, condemning them unqualifiedly, I sought to indicate my view that there was another side to this issue, and that I was not convinced of the correctness of his view and of the position which the administration appears to be taking that these raids should at all costs be prevented by the United States.

I was therefore interested to note in this morning's Washington Post a column entitled "The Cuban Raids," with the subtitle "Why Stand in the Way?" written by Roscoe Drummond. The article expresses a view with which I find myself in general accord. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CUBAN RAIDS—WHY STAND IN THE WAY? (By Roscoe Drummond)

Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugee's harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fer-

1963

with many requests for the court to enter orders against the local officials.

The Justice Department should stop its well-known practice of filing suits right and left whenever a member of some minority group makes an allegation unsupported by proof, and contrary to the facts. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly on protecting constitutional rights. Under the facts, it has no authority whatever in this matter in the city of Greenwood. Our State and local governments have the responsibility for maintaining law and order; and Greenwood, Miss., and Leflore County are doing this very thing under the most difficult circumstances.

The law-abiding citizens of a peaceful community like Greenwood rightfully look to their local public officials to maintain law and order and to protect them from unlawful invasions and breaches of the peace.

In connection with this very suit, I should like to turn briefly, not merely to what I might say about the situation, but to what Judge Claude F. Clayton said yesterday at the regular term of court in Mississippi, in passing on the application of the Justice Department for a temporary restraining order against these very officers I have been talking about.

Judge Clayton is one of the outstanding Federal judges in the entire Nation. I assure my colleagues that I know Judge Clayton personally, and have known him for a long time. He is an experienced, able judge. He had served on the bench before he was appointed a Federal judge. He is a man of firm convictions. He is resolute by nature. He has the greatest professional pride and also the highest judicial pride. He represents integrity on and off the bench.

As I have said, in hearing this matter yesterday, on a temporary basis, Judge Clayton very properly ruled that the request of the Justice Department was not sufficient to "warrant trampling on the rights" of these officials, and he refused to take any action pending a full hearing on the merits on Thursday of this week.

In announcing his action, Judge Clayton said:

I detest any action on the part of anyone which interferes in any way with any right of any person which is given and protected by law.

This includes the right to register and the right to vote, provided the standards now rightfully established by the laws of the State of Mississippi are met.

These are the rights which belong to all of us. These are the rights which belong to the city of Greenwood, its officials and its police officers and to the officers of Leflore County.

Mayor Charles E. Sampson, of Greenwood, has rightfully announced his intention to keep law and order in Greenwood, Mayor Sampson and City Commissioners B. A. Hammond and W. G. Mize, Jr., have done an outstanding job in dealing with this most difficult situation.

The chief of police, Curtis Lary, has taken precautions to prevent breaches of the peace, and has repeatedly made a

public announcement to these groups, as follows:

Because of present public excitement resulting from recent events here, it is considered necessary to peace and order that no large organized groups be allowed on the streets of Greenwood. Therefore, you must disperse. If it is your purpose to go to the courthouse to apply for voter registration, you will not be prevented from doing so but in order to insure that there will be no breach of the peace you must proceed in smaller groups.

This is a step which is absolutely necessary in order to maintain law and order under the most difficult circumstances and tremendous provocation.

The real issue is whether unwanted and unwelcome outside organizers, vote peddlers and pressure groups will be permitted to invade a peaceful community for the sole purpose of creating turmoil and disturbing the peace.

These professional troublemakers are not interested in Greenwood, in Leflore County, or in Mississippi. Nor are they truly interested in the welfare of the Negro citizens of that community. Nor are they welcome or wanted by either race. Their sole purpose is to create strife and discord and to overturn the peaceful and harmonious cooperation among the people of the two races built up over generations.

These people, representing the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, CORE, and other notorious busybodies, had hardly parked their cars in Greenwood before they were sending telegrams to Washington calling for Federal troops.

As is usual in such cases, once the trouble starts these paid professional agitators will be satisfied and will move on elsewhere to start new battles and new tensions, leaving behind them the turmoil and unrest they were paid to create. Unfortunately, they also will leave to the local people of both races the hopeless task of repairing the damage and attempting to restore the peaceful and harmonious cooperation between the races built up over the years.

The people of Greenwood are not responsible for the situation in which they find themselves. They have acted in good faith, with remarkable patience and admirable restraint, under the most extreme provocation.

I am confident the duly constituted law enforcement officers of the city of Greenwood and Leflore County will continue to maintain law and order.

To the degree that I have kept in touch with these gentlemen during this ordeal, I can say that they are carrying this added responsibility, and have uniformly obtained certain assurances which were supported by action from day to day.

I think the public will soon realize what is happening and will no longer follow these schemes of publicity and building up of false issues and the carrying out of such planned provocation.

Instead of the Federal Government filing suits against local authorities, if they are going to be there at all, they ought to be standing side by side or at least encouraging them to follow a pattern of their own law as made by the

legislature and as written in the regular constitutional way and in the processes of self-government, and to maintain law and order and orderly processes of government in that way.

Heretofore all the complaint has been directed to the charge that local forces do not maintain law and order. In this case the entire pattern has been within the processes of the law, according to the statutes, and action through duly constituted authority.

If that is not protection through local government and self-government and representative government and free government, I do not know where we can turn for an example of it.

I warn the people of this Nation against taking a superficial and surface impression, artificially created. They should look to the facts and determine the real issues and to get down to the heart of the problem.

Instead of condemning, we should commend. I believe that the filing of suits of injunction against all the officers is an invitation to violence and an invitation for some group outside the law to act for themselves.

I hope that this matter will be reconsidered. In the meantime I urge the people of the city of Greenwood and the county of Leflore, through their officials, to stand their ground and continue, of course, to follow their course as in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. As my colleague realizes, there has been no allegation that an attempt has been made to prevent people from registering.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill of particulars in the suit that has been filed. Perhaps the Senator has.

Mr. EASTLAND. There has been no allegation of that kind; in fact, 300 persons have applied to register in the past few days. Those who are qualified will be registered. There is no such contention as has been suggested. Outside agitators from New York and other areas talk to Negroes and say, "If you want to get relief, if you want to get social security, if you want to get commodities, come with us." Then they take them in a body and parade them down the street, demonstrating and stopping all traffic, walking through red lights, and being taken to the courthouse. The only obstacle has been that they cannot demonstrate, they cannot stop traffic, they cannot violate the ordinances of that city. When they reach the courthouse they can go to the clerk's office at any time and make their application, as provided by the laws of our State.

Judge Clayton is a great lawyer. I agree with my colleague that he is one of the great judges of this country. Charley Sampson, the mayor, has rendered distinguished service. The chief of police has done a good job. The city attorney has done a good job. There is no allegation anywhere that an attempt

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5097

menting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we would do more to help the Cuban resisters both inside and outside Cuba. Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then at the very least it should be making suggestions and helping them to do it right.

THE SITUATION IN GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been informed that while I was at lunch, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made a statement on the Senate floor which at least brings into question the propriety of the action taken by the Attorney General of the United States in connection with the situation in Greenwood, Leflore County, Miss., where the United States is seeking to enjoin local authorities from interfering with a petition by the local citizenry—Negroes, to be precise—for the redress of grievances.

I express my approval of the action of the Attorney General in instituting the suit. I think it was his manifest duty to do so, in view of the fact that constitutional rights are brought into question, including the right of petition for the redress of grievances by constituted authorities. I approve very much of the Attorney General's taking this action.

As a matter of general principle, I have very deep faith in the processes of the law and the courts. I have argued this point before, and I do so again. In the face of situations which have such incendiary possibilities as in this particular area about which the press has written so much, the chances will be very much better for the processes of order and tranquillity if an individual citizen

feels that tongue may be given for his grievances through the courts, and that there is a possibility of redress.

The Attorney General is in this civil injunction suit proceeding under section 1971 of title 42 of the United States Code, which was part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The important thing, which I wish to emphasize, is that here is an outlet, here is a substitute for either the effort which the marchers are making or the efforts to stop them which are being made by the police and other municipal authorities. In an area where there are the raw materials of violence, the capability of the courts to act in situations of this kind is designed to head them off and to give, as I say, an outlet, a tongue, to every man's grievance.

Therefore, I have always favored strongly the so-called part III in regard to civil rights, so that the Attorney General might sue in representative cases; and I feel very deeply that this is the way to save ourselves from the dangers involved in such situations—dangers which we have already seen erupt into violence, not only like that which occurred at Oxford, Miss., where marshals and troops are employed, but also the danger involved when people are fired on while they are in their homes and the danger involved when buildings are burned. This is no tea party. This situation is very, very dangerous, in terms of the future of the Nation. So anything we can do to give it a peaceful outlet—and I think recourse to the courts is the most logical and most desirable procedure—we should encourage.

Although I respect, and indeed would fight for, the right of the Senator from Mississippi to say whatever he believes he should say, I also feel it my duty to juxtapose to the general thrust of the statement of the Senator from Mississippi—as I understand it from what I have been told by my assistants who heard him make it—this statement of my own position.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New York that, if I correctly understood him, I am glad he did not substantially contradict the facts I related in regard to the registration—in other words, that the applications were being received and were being passed on, without denying any person the right to file his application in an orderly way and to have it passed on. The Senator from New York does not know of any exception to that general statement, does he?

Mr. JAVITS. I was addressing myself to what we have read in the press about the action of the police and other authorities in blocking and breaking up any march by a number of persons—for example, on one day last week by a group of some 100, and on another by a group of some 42. It is claimed—and the courts will try it out—that in the community there is a climate of intimidation which runs counter to the fundamental provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act which prohibit interference with any effort to register and to vote. I say to the Senator from Mississippi that the courts will decide as to that.

For myself, I believe that the path of constitutional propriety is to permit people to march peaceably in order to petition for redress of their grievances.

But the fundamental point I make now is even more limited than that. I only say that if we do not want violence—and I know of no Senator who does want it—in my opinion, people must have an outlet. So I think litigation of this character is a proper and sensible outlet; and I hope very much the Attorney General will prosecute this suit with speed and with diligence.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that it would be one thing to bring a suit if someone had been denied an opportunity to file an application or to take the examination or to register, or even had protested and had been arrested on that account, or if someone wanted to test the legality of an arrest. But this is a broadside lawsuit, in the absence of an application by anyone to have the law-enforcement machinery used to enjoin such action. It has not been charged that there has been a violation of anyone's right. It is to that point that I addressed my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I only say that when it appears that in a particular community it would be unhealthy for some persons to register and to vote, the U.S. Government has a right to take action. In my opinion, those who at least seemingly make the situation look unhealthy have the burden to withdraw such barriers.

So I think the Attorney General is taking action in that situation; and I am glad he is doing so by means of action of that kind.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—PLAN WITH SOVIET UNION FOR RECIPROCAL BURNING OF OBSOLETE BOMBERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I see on the floor the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Therefore, I wish to refer now, briefly, to a statement he made yesterday.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], had a number of remarks to make about my efforts to get a straight story from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on its plan with the Soviet Union for the reciprocal burning of obsolete bombers. He charged me with doing a "disservice to the cause of peace" by implying that officials of the Disarmament Agency are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by newspaper reporters. He then went on to make out a case for the fact that the Disarmament Agency officials were misunderstood by newspaper reporters.

Mr. President, the whole episode goes back to March 9, when, in a speech I made in Aurora, Ill., I asked whether it was true that plans were in the making for the reciprocal burning of 30 American B-47's and 30 Russian Badgers, in a giant disarmament demonstration. On March 11, wire service stories which appeared in the newspapers reported:

U.S. Disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now let me quote the reference by the Senator from Pennsylvania to the denial story, in his remarks on the floor yesterday. He said:

This story which appeared in the papers on Monday, March 11, was based on telephone conversations between reporters and the Agency spokesman. These conversations took place on Sunday, March 10. On Monday morning, March 11, the Agency representative who spoke to the press the day before felt after reading the morning papers that his earlier comments to the newspaper correspondents evidently had not been clearly understood. To clarify any misunderstanding the agency at noon that day released the following statement through the State Department.

The statement referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) was that the Disarmament Agency had been engaged in several internal studies, and that among them was the possibility of a simultaneous reduction of B-47's and Russian Badgers.

Before I proceed, Mr. President, let me quote from a press release which the Senator from Pennsylvania issued yesterday in support of his remarks on the floor. Here is what it said, in part:

It is a disservice to the cause of peace to imply that honorable men patriotically and intelligently serving their country are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by reporters. Neither charge is true. The first suggestion is inaccurate; the second, just plain wrong.

Mr. President, if my suggestion that Disarmament officials are being misunderstood by reporters is "just plain wrong," as the Senator from Pennsylvania claimed, why is it necessary for him to defend the denial story which was based on the conversations with the Disarmament official? Why is it necessary for the Senator from Pennsylvania to point out that, after reading the newspapers, the Disarmament official decided that he had not been clearly understood?

Another point I should like to raise right here is that if—as the Senator from Pennsylvania contended—the Disarmament official hastened to issue a statement clarifying the situation at noon on March 11, why did the press release referred to carry the date of March 12? Could it be that the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11 prodded the Disarmament official to issue a clarification on March 12? In that testimony, Secretary Rusk told the committee that the bomber-destruction plan had been under study and consideration, and that the stories about a denial from the Disarmament Agency must have stemmed from a misunderstanding.

Another point made in the press release by the Senator from Pennsylvania was that the Disarmament Agency told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the bomber-destruction plan. This raises several questions.

First. If the Disarmament Agency had told the whole truth—including the fact

that the bomber-destruction plan about which I inquired had been under discussion—is it likely that competent newspapermen would have been so lacking in understanding that they would have taken that statement to be a flat denial of the plan?

Second. Why did it take the Disarmament Agency 3 days to tell the whole truth?

I submit that the fact remains that I asked a perfectly legitimate question, based on solid information; and the Disarmament Agency answered it in a fashion that caused most newspapers in the United States to publish headlines to the effect that the Government had denied the existence of a bomber-destruction plan. The fact also remains that the Disarmament Agency apparently did not get around to trying to correct this impression until after Secretary of State Rusk had testified that the denial story was erroneous. With the flow of news being what it is today, of course, the Agency's clarification never saw the light of day in any newspaper I read. So the public was left with the impression that the question I had put to the administration had no basis in fact. I say this was as neat an operation in news management—whether wittingly or unwittingly—as any I have witnessed since the New Frontier came into office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the RECORD two newspaper stories, one from the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, entitled "Plan To Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied," and the other from the Washington Star of the same date, entitled "Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

PLAN TO BURN 30 BOMBERS HOTLY DENIED

U.S. disarmament officials denied yesterday that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.

GOLDWATER asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"

GOLDWATER said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."

A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said he is puzzled by GOLDWATER's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.

That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.

The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that

there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.

The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.

But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers would be no more than a token gesture, in any event, since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 11, 1963]

ADMINISTRATION DENIES BOMBER-BURNING PLAN

U.S. disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator GOLDWATER of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.

Senator GOLDWATER asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"

GOLDWATER STATEMENT

Senator GOLDWATER said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."

A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said yesterday he is puzzled by Senator GOLDWATER's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.

That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.

The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.

INTERNAL DISCUSSION

The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.

But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers—both obsolescent bombers—would be no more than a token gesture in any event since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I listened with interest to the comments made by my good friend from Arizona. As a result of what he has said, I should like to ask him whether

5070

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 2

concern about power rates. So now is the time to move, full speed.

III. GO ON THE PUBLIC-INTEREST OFFENSIVE—FULL SPEED

I have suggested we go on the offensive full speed with a positive story, and I've outlined some proven techniques. I have suggested we recruit all possible allies in a broad program of assisting not only ourselves but electric consumers of the cities too, and I have suggested how it might be done. Now I suggest we go on the offensive to reverse or reform certain trends and practices of the Nation's power industry that are not in the public interest.

I believe it's in the public interest for the rural electric to have legal protection against these territorial raids, whether they be in the form of a sellout or piracy of individual loads. In several States you have demonstrated that some sort of protective, fairplay legislation can be passed. I recommend that, in every State where such protection does not exist, you move through your statewide to achieve it and that you give your statewide resources it needs to do the job. If Idaho could do it—and Arkansas, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and other States—then so can the rest of you who need it.

And I think the time has come, too, when we should call on our lawyers and legislative experts to make further efforts to determine what types of Federal territorial protection, legislative and otherwise, are possible.

In another area of the public interest, I believe the consumer groups have a real stake in joining us to get repeal of the vast subsidies now flowing to the power companies under the fast tax writeoff schemes, including that absurd 3-percent tax credit subsidy Congress gave the power companies last year. Even the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. testified against that one, although it would have meant a \$75 million annual windfall for the company. A.T. & T. said it would be an outright subsidy for something a utility was supposed to do anyway.

But the power companies were right in there fighting for it. They don't share such concern for the taxpayer any more than they do for the ratepayer.

I don't have to document to this audience that REA, the Interior Department, the Corps of Engineers, TVA, and the Federal Power Commission are not all going in exactly the same direction on matters affecting us. We have become increasingly disturbed by the actions of the Federal Power Commission.

The latest and most alarming is FPC's very recent decision to declare the rural electric co-ops to be public utilities and to exercise jurisdiction over many G. & T. cooperatives and some distribution systems. FPC's action promises to give us all the disadvantages of being public utilities without giving any of the advantages. This action, unless reversed, could throw us to the mercy of the power companies and give them everything they've sought against us but failed to get through normal processes—prolonged public hearings on our loans and wholesale rates, review and appeal to the courts of every FPC decision they don't like.

I believe it is now necessary and in the public interest that the administration exert more leadership and solidarity of purpose in the interest of an abundant supply of electric power in the economy at low cost, for everybody. Somehow we have just got to help get the various agencies of the administration going in the same direction—the right direction—on power.

The President of the United States has called several White House conferences to get people together and crystallize policy in several other areas, such as recreation, conservation, and education.

You have already made suggestions in this direction, with respect to power, in the regional meetings, even when the need was less urgent. Therefore, in your behalf, I now ask the President to call a White House conference on electric energy at the earliest possible time, to include all sources of energy and every segment of electric power generation and distribution.

I won't dwell this morning on other aspects of our public interest legislative program which we have explored together in the past. Your policy is clear in support of regional interties and common carrier transmission lines, and we will be in there fighting for them. We will also do everything we possibly can to secure authorizations and funds for the water resources development projects which you support but which have not been realized as yet.

In the session of Congress just begun, we expect the hardest fight in years—even tougher than last year—on REA loan funds, particularly for generation and transmission. And we must drive again, I believe, for the loan account bookkeeping arrangement to give us credit for the loan funds we repay.

Great battles lie ahead for us. Ever more rapidly changing times make our chances of continuing success more difficult each year.

CURBING THE CUBAN EXILES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very good editorial from the New Herald Tribune entitled "We Have To Curb the Cuban Exiles."

Since my speech of yesterday urging a strict enforcement of our laws against the irresponsible conduct of Cuban exiles, manifested through their raids on Cuban and Russian shipping from our shores, I have received many calls and messages agreeing completely with my speech.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE TO CURB THE CUBAN EXILES

The dissatisfaction of the Cuban exiles over U.S. Government efforts to curb their raids by sea against Castro and his Russian exiles is evident and understandable. To them, anything that harasses communism in the Caribbean is legitimate and necessary, and many Americans sympathize with that attitude and the actions that flow from it. But the reasons why Washington is backing its disapprobation of the raids with stringent enforcement of American neutrality statutes are sound and compelling.

The raids have not, and, under present circumstances, cannot have any real effect in weakening either Castro's hold on Cuba or the Soviet Union's hold on Castro. They are pinpricks. And while the same may be said for anti-Castro guerrilla attacks in Cuba itself, the raids are taking place at sea—that is, in an area where policing becomes an international, rather than a municipal, obligation.

The law of the sea regarding military activity by those who do not act under the commission of a legal, recognized government is very ancient and very stern. To put no finer point on it, such activity is piracy.

To be sure, in recent years there has been a tendency to condone illegal acts committed on the high seas (as well as in the air) when these are politically motivated. The granting of asylum by Brazil to the terrorists who seized a Venezuelan freighter is a case in point. But the trend is not a healthy one for those who travel by sea or in the international air on their lawful occasions. And in the particular case of Cuba, seaborne raids

by exiles pose a special danger to the United States.

Some of those exiles undoubtedly would like to precipitate an armed conflict between the United States and Castro's forces as the surest way in which to free Cuba. Some of Castro's officers, if not the dictator himself, are not averse to raising the temperature of the Caribbean in order to keep Russian troops in the island and bring back the Soviet missiles. And the Soviet Union itself, after backing down on the missile question, might well wish to assert itself on an issue in which international law is on its side.

This could mean a succession of incidents and reprisals in which the United States might lose its freedom of action and be forced into hostilities over acts as meaningless in themselves as the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand that precipitated World War I. That would be intolerable.

Surely Washington can acquire the information, as it has the means, to prevent a type of anti-Castro activity that cannot benefit the cause of a free America and could set the world aflame.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] spoke last Sunday evening, March 31, 1963, before the opening dinner of the biennial meeting of the B'nai B'rith Women at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In his remarks, Senator KEATING, one of the Nation's most respected champions of equal rights, called for an end of discrimination against women and chronicled the increasingly important role which women are playing in all phases of our national life.

The B'nai B'rith Women have been concerned throughout their history with problems of equal rights and equal justice.

It was fitting that Senator KEATING, with his magnificent record in this field, should have been chosen to address this outstanding organization.

His pertinent and eloquent remarks, will be of interest to many Members of the Senate, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KEATING URGES PROGRESS IN ENDING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

It is appropriate, I feel, that your dynamic organization should meet here in Washington. Washington is the old-fashioned town meeting of America's years of birth and growth—a town meeting magnified in size, but unchanged in essence. Under the dome of the Capitol, as under the roof of the old town hall, the voice of the people is heard—the will of the people is made manifest.

This home of our National Government is the beating heart of the body politic we call our Republic.

It keeps in constant, unending flow, to the remotest reaches of this vast Nation, the lifeblood of our historic traditions of freedom add human dignity. And just as the heart takes its strength from the body, only to return it, so does government take its strength from the body of citizens—180 million Americans—who are America. Many life forces flow into the mainstream of our national life to create the surging power of that mainstream.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5069

role of the program in the future. That role includes more than just maintaining good electric service in our own rural areas. It includes exporting the REA idea to other areas in the Western Hemisphere.

In many Central and South American countries rural development is the most promising bulwark against the growing pressures of communism. It deserves our full support.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the most inspiring address by a great American, Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SPEED AHEAD

The theme of this meeting is: "Rural Electrification—Important to America's Strength."

This is the story we want to tell—more of the future than of the past. We want the Nation to be aware of the continuing, increasingly important role our systems are playing in the modern society.

I. RECAST THE IMAGE

I want to recommend to you a program of action, beyond anything we have done yet, for getting us on the offensive with a positive living story. I want us to proudly hold up our heads like men, roll up our sleeves and get started full speed ahead. We must recast the image of rural electrification.

Too many people, even some of our friends, think and talk of us in terms of the depression-day programs of the thirties. Too many of us think and talk in terms of the dead past. We recite our glorious success in lighting the darkness of rural America and virtually ignore the tremendous contribution we are making now and will make to the total strength of the Nation.

We shall be judged now and in the future, not on what we have done, but on what we are doing today and shall do tomorrow.

What we're doing today

What are we doing today? We are serving 10 percent of the population and perhaps over three-fourths of the landmass of the country—the difficult part.

We are serving the breadbasket of the world, and partly because of our service the American farmer produces more food of higher quality at lower prices to consumers than any farmer anywhere in all of history.

We are serving more than 80,000 rural schools and churches.

We are employing directly more than 28,000 people with an annual payroll of more than \$140 million, and much of this employment is right in the middle of some of the most depressed areas in America, where employment and income really count.

We are providing a yardstick for determining what electricity should cost, and every electric consumer in America benefits from that.

And because we are extending the benefits of electricity to so many millions of people, we have created a new billion-dollar-a-year market, still growing, for electric appliances and equipment. Most of this is made in the cities and gives jobs to city people, and to those in all the related fields of mining, transportation, and marketing.

All this that we are doing is new, a completely new sector of the economy.

We are serving directly hundreds of defense installations, all vital to the security of this Nation—missile bases of all types, missile and satellite tracking stations, radar and navigation control stations, even in the

remotest areas—that help protect all America.

Throughout the United States we are taking the lead in rural areas development projects, just as we took the lead in getting the area development programs established. Rural areas development and the Area Redevelopment Administration have already achieved remarkable success and they're just getting started.

There is something more here, too—in our rural electric program—something which in the longer reach of history may be even more important than our tangible accomplishments. We are extending the cooperative, private ownership of electric systems to more than 6 million American households. Every consumer member of a rural electric system and every citizen of a local power district has one vote in the conduct of its affairs and the establishment of its policies. This is democracy at its finest, and this is the cause which America seeks to carry to the other nations of the world.

The REA pattern

In the highest Government circles in Washington this is becoming known as the REA pattern. As you know, we are being asked by the Agency for International Development (AID) of the State Department to lend our experience and know-how to the task of helping the critically important developing countries establish rural electrification cooperatives of their own.

Last November National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and AID signed a reimbursable agreement in President Kennedy's office whereby National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is coordinating your efforts in this area. On that occasion, the President was highly complimentary of you and the rural electrification program as it is being carried out in this country and as you will now help others, and he underscored its importance to the Nation by saying, "I think this can be very important, in fact, one of the most significant actions taken by the AID agency."

For our part, all of us are proud, as Americans, that the country is turning to our program in a time of crisis as a significant weapon for democracy in the worldwide struggle with communism.

All of these, and many others, are things rural electric systems are doing today. The rural electric systems are dynamic organizations, geared to the needs of the present in their own communities and responsive to the needs of the United States of America.

And they are ready, willing and able to go full speed ahead to meet the needs and challenges of tomorrow. They are prepared to serve their areas completely—and I mean provide the leadership and serve anything and everything that needs serving in those areas.

II. DEVELOP ALLIES

The second part of the program I want to present to you this morning deals with developing allies among other consumer groups. We've given lip service to this in the past, but unfortunately little has been done beyond the valuable work performed constantly through ECIC—the Electric Consumers Information Committee—in Washington.

If our program is to go full speed ahead, we must take other action now, to develop and hold all possible allies. To do this, we must identify our interests with those of consumers everywhere in a positive manner, urban as well as rural. To get and keep consumer support in the urban areas we must join with all loyal organized consumer groups in a drive against high electric rates everywhere. The desire for low cost electricity is something we share with all other consumer-oriented groups. We must take to them the story of the ridiculous padding that goes into the rate base of the cost-plus power company operations.

I recommend that every system and statewide take steps to establish a local and State counterpart of our national Electric Consumers Information Committee, now. This will provide a vehicle for bringing together on a local and statewide basis all consumer groups which have a natural interest in low cost power. This has already been done with some success in a few States. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the national Electric Consumers Information Committee are ready to assist all of you with any organizational details.

Electric consumers are being overcharged by well over a billion dollars a year by the monopoly power companies, and next to nothing is ever done about it. Under our present system of regulation, next to nothing can be done about it.

Our economists have compared the allowable rate of return for 38 large electric utilities with their actual rate of return between 1956 and 1960, inclusively. They calculate the total overcharge by just these companies during this 5-year period at \$1,259,043,000—and this is only part of it. Incidentally, if the people of Nevada are interested, the total overcharge during this period by the Nevada Power Co. is calculated at \$5,280,000—assuming that 6 percent is a fair rate of return. No wonder it can afford to build spite lines in the desert to try to kill Amargosa.

Here is how it works. A rate, usually suggested by the power company, is fixed by a regulatory commission which is supposed to give the company a certain rate of return, or profit, over and above all operating costs and taxes. But almost always the company gets the rates fixed so high that it earns considerably more than the allowable rate of return.

Most commissions are in effect powerless to do anything about this. The company keeps it.

I propose that we join with other consumer organizations in demanding a congressional investigation of power company overcharges, and in supporting State and Federal legislation to give commissions the power to make them do it—make them in some way return these overcharges to their consumers.

This might be done in part by an amendment to the Federal Power Act to provide that all earnings in excess of a fair rate of return must be used in the public interests as provided by the commission. This would require the Federal Power Commission to check into power company earnings each year. Such an FPC amendment could apply, of course, only to interstate and wholesale power sales. State commissions need similar legislation to cover retail sales.

If a commission should find it not feasible to require a company to actually return the excess to each consumer—though this would be the most desirable—then the commission might treat the excess profits as capital contributed by the consumer, and deduct them from the rate base. This would help bring about a reduction in rates, including wholesale rates to rural electricians.

Now is an excellent time to call for a congressional investigation and to try for reform legislation. There is mounting evidence that consumers are beginning to rebel against high electric rates. In November, the Boston Herald demanded editorially that the new Governor of Massachusetts do something about the high power rates in New England.

A few weeks later a group of industrialists in New York City charged publicly that industrial expansion there is being and would be seriously slowed unless the wall of unreasonable power rates is lowered as soon as possible.

As people everywhere constantly use more power in their homes and businesses and industries, as people realize that power is a rapidly growing cost factor in everything they consume, I predict a rising interest and